```
Case 3:08-cv-01176-HU Document 9 Filed 11/10/08 Page 1 of 4
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
                        FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
9
10 WHEATSTRAW LLC, an Oregon
   limited liability company,
11
                                        No.
                                              08-1176-HU
                   Plaintiff,
12
                                         FINDINGS AND
        v.
13
                                         RECOMMENDATION
   LINDA-DARNELL MASON, TAMMY
  DELANEY, MICHAEL EDWARD
   DELANEY, and all others,
15
                   Defendants.
16
17
   MICHAEL-EDWARD and
   TAMMIE-MARIE [Family: Delaney])
18
        Third Party Intervenors.
19
20
21
  Gary K. Kahn
Tiffany A. Elkins
Reeves, Kahn & Hennessy
   P.O. Box 86100
23 Portland, Oregon 97286
        Attorneys for plaintiff
24
   Michael-Edward and Tammie-Marie
25
  P.O. Box 1804
   Fairview, Oregon 97024
26
        Pro se
27
28 | FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION Page 1
```

HUBEL, Magistrate Judge:

12

26

27

///

2 This action was removed from the Circuit Court for the State of Oregon, County of Multnomah. It was brought as a forcible entry 3 and detainer (FED). After a General Judgment was entered in favor of plaintiff Wheatstraw LLC (Wheatstraw) and against defendants, 6 two of the defendants, the Delaneys, filed a Notice of Removal. Wheatstraw requests that the action be remanded to state court on 7 the grounds that 1) the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the action; and 2) the Delaneys failed to obtain the consent $10 \mid \text{of}$ the other defendant, Linda-Darnell Mason, as required for removal. The motion to remand is granted. 11

The burden of establishing federal jurisdiction is on the 13 party seeking removal, and the removal statute is strictly construed against removal jurisdiction. Prize Frize, Inc. v. Matrix (U.S.) Inc., 167 F.3d 1261, 1265 (9th Cir. 1999). A defendant may 16 remove an action to federal court only if it could have been brought there originally. <u>Caterpillar, Inc. v. Williams</u>, 482 U.S. 386, 392 (1987); <u>Jackson v. Southern California Gas Co.</u>, 881 F.2d 19 638, 641 (9th Cir. 1989). The presence or absence of federal 20 question jurisdiction in a removal case is governed by the well 21 pleaded complaint rule, which provides that federal jurisdiction 22 exists only when a federal question is presented on the face of the plaintiff's properly pleaded complaint. Caterpillar, 482 U.S. at 24 392; Balcorta v. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., 208 F.3d 1102, $1106 ext{ (9}^{th} ext{ Cir. } 2000).$

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION Page 2

The face of the removed complaint alleges that the landlord, Wheatstraw, is entitled to possession of property situated at 5126 NE 21 $^{ ext{st}}$ Avenue, Portland, Oregon, pursuant to Or. Rev. Stat. ${\mathbb S}$ 86.755(5). The complaint also states on its face that the plaintiff is a resident of Portland, Oregon and the defendants also reside in Portland, Oregon. Thus, this action could not have been brought originally in federal court because it does not present a federal question and the parties are not diverse.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1446, all defendants must join or consent to 10 the removal notice. Prize Frize, 167 F.3d at 1266; Parrino v. FHP, Inc., 146 F.3d 699, 703 (9^{th} Cir. 1998). If all defendants do not join in removal, the removal notice is defective. Prize Frize, 167 13 F.3d at 1266. There is no indication in the record that defendant Linda-Darnell Mason joined in or consented to the removal notice, which is signed only by defendants Tammie-Marie Delaney and Michael-Edward Delaney.

I recommend that the motion to remand (doc. # 6) be GRANTED.

Scheduling Order

The above Findings and Recommendation will be referred to a United States District Judge for review. Objections, if any, are due November 25, 2008. If no objections are filed, review of the Findings and Recommendation will go under advisement on that date.

If objections are filed, a response to the objections is due

24 ///

1

7

8

9

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

25 ///

26 ///

27

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION Page 3

1 December 9, 2008, and the review of the Findings and Recommendation will go under advisement on that date. Dated this 10th day of November, 2008. /s/ Dennis James Hubel Dennis James Hubel United States Magistrate Judge 28 OPINION Page 4

Case 3:08-cv-01176-HU Document 9 Filed 11/10/08 Page 4 of 4